



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/802,518 | 03/16/2004 | Craig M. Janik | 088245-8242 | 3980 |
| 23524 7590 08/24/2012 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 150 EAST GILMAN STREET P.O. BOX 1497 MADISON, WI 53701-1497 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| DEAN, RAYMOND S | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2618 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 08/24/2012 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i> | Application No. 10/802,518 | Applicant(s) JANIK ET AL. | |
| | Examiner RAYMOND DEAN | Art Unit 2618 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) RAYMOND DEAN. (3) ____.
- (2) Nicholas Lagerwall (Reg. No. 63,272). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 17 August 2012.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☐ 101 ☐ 112 ☐ 102 ☐ 103 ☒ Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 31.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Mr. Lagerwall informed Examiner Dean that the Appellants declined the amendment proposed by Examiner Dean to place the claims in condition for allowance. The proposed amendment was to modify the independent claims with the limitations of Claim 31. Mr. Lagerwall indicated to Examiner Dean that since the Appellants paid the required fees in order to Appeal to the Board, that the Appellants were interested with going forward with an Appeal.

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/Raymond S Dean/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618
 571-272-7877

August 22, 2012